

Remarks

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Specification Objections

The disclosure is objected to because of some informalities in the specification. Responsive to this, the informalities in the Abstract and on pages 3, 4, 6, 7 and 10 have been amended.

In the Abstract, lines 4, 5, 8 and 10, the “means” has been amended as “device” and the “engagable” has been amended as “engageable”. On page 3, line 18, the “first” has been amended as “second”. On page 4, lines 6-22, the “forth” has been amended as “fourth” and the “section al” has been amended as “sectional”. On pages 6-7, paragraphs [0008] and [0009] have been amended to correct the “23” as “32”. On page 10, paragraph [0015] has been amended to clarify in what sense the stem is lockable with the stop.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 has been canceled due to the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zabel.

Claim Rejections

Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zabel. Claim 12 also is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gill and Taylor et al. Responsive to this, Claims 12 and 14 have been canceled by this Amendment. Those claims that have been withdrawn from consideration

have been canceled by this Amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that Claims 13, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Responsive to this, the subject matters of the canceled Claim 12 have been incorporated into currently amended Claim 13 in independent form, and the subject matters of the canceled Claims 12 and 14 have been incorporated into currently amended Claim 16 in independent form. In addition, the informalities of canceled Claim 14 objected by the Examiner have been corrected in the amended Claim 16 and clarified by the amended specification. It is believed that amended Claims 13 and 16 are in a condition to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Original Claim 15 depends on amended Claim 13. Since amended Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form, original Claim 15 has proper dependency. Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 15 is also in a condition to overcome the Examiner's objections.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is now believed that the subject patent application has been placed in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

**This Amendment has been prepared by Applicant and is being filed
by the undersigned attorney on Applicant's behalf.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David I. Klein". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "David" being more prominent.

David I. Klein
Registration No. 33,253

Dated: *22 July 2005*

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410)465-6678